

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action three of the four claims were rejected as being anticipated by the disclosure of the previously cited Amir reference, while Claim 17 was rejected as being obvious in view of the additional disclosure of the previously cited Wolf reference. In response, sole independent Claim 13 has been amended, and it is believed to be patentable over the prior art for the reasons set forth below.

Specifically, Claim 13 relates to an image processing apparatus arranged to effect control of reproduction of a moving image in accordance with a predetermined reproduction time set in advance. If the predetermined reproduction time is passed without a first button being pressed, a reproducing unit stops reproducing the moving image. If, however, the first button is pressed before the predetermined reproduction time is passed then the reproducing unit continues to reproduce the moving image even if the predetermined reproduction time is passed, to reproduce the moving image up to the end thereof, and the reproducing unit starts reproduction of a next moving image which is not included in the moving image reproduced up to the end thereof. Also, if a second button is pressed during the reproduction of the moving image continued by the reproducing unit after the first button is pressed before the predetermined reproduction time is passed, then the reproducing unit terminates the continued reproduction of the moving image and starts reproduction in accordance with the predetermined reproduction time to reproduce the next moving image.

That is, in the present invention, if the moving image is not reproduced up to the end thereof due to the depression of the second button, the reproduction unit starts the

reproduction of the next moving image in accordance with the predetermined reproduction time. According to this feature of the present invention, more useful slide show system can be available.

In this regard, Applicant respectfully submits that the above-described feature of the present invention is not disclosed by either of the cited references. In particular, the Amir reference discloses in Figs.1-2 to switch over reproduction between a skim video and full length video in response to a click of a tab 18 Amir discloses in Fig.2 ([0024]) that if a second button is depressed, then reproduction is switched over from a frame 24' of the full length video 21 back to a frame 24 of the skim video 20 which is a condensed version video of the corresponding full length video 21. That is, this switching of reproduction takes place between the original video 21 and the video 20 extracted therefrom, and therefore does not disclose to switch over the reproduction from the time line 21 to a time line (i.e., "the next moving image" recited in amended claim 13) other than the time line 20. In this connection, it is stated in the Office Action (paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6) that Amir teaches that if a next result button 84 is depressed during reproduction of the full length video, reproduction of the current moving image is stopped to start reproduction of the next moving image. However, as described above, switching over of reproduction in Amir takes place between the moving image and the corresponding skim video and thus the "next moving image" in Amir is part of the existing image. Therefore, Amir fails to disclose that if the second button is pressed, as required in Claim 13, the reproducing unit terminates the continued reproduction of the moving image in response to pressing of the second button and then starts reproduction in accordance with the predetermined reproduction time to reproduce the next moving image which is not included in the moving image which the

reproduction unit terminates. The Wolf reference is relied on only as the prior art which merely discloses a digital camera included in an image processing apparatus, but Wolf does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Amir as a rejecting reference.

For these various reasons it is respectfully submitted that the claims as now presented are allowable over the prior art, wherefore Applicant solicits the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/
John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200